



JFW/HF
Attorney Docket 0553-0276.01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of)
Hirakata et al.)
Serial No.: 10/774,834)
Filed: February 9, 2004)
For: Liquid Crystal Display Device)
Art Unit: 2871)
Examiner: James A. Dudek)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

September 15, 2006
(Date of Deposit)

Catherine Andres
Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered Rep.

Catherine Andres 9-15-06
Signature Date

Sir:

Applicants have the following response to the Final Rejection of June 15, 2006. Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 20, 26, 32, 38, 41, 47 and 53 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Murade (US 6,683,592). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner contends that the feature of independent Claim 20 of at least one convex portion overlapping with the at least one source wiring is allegedly shown in Murade and cites "organic layer 7 and region 302" in Murade in support thereof. With regard to